



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,162	06/29/2001	Jason E. Black	MS1-741US	1458
22801	7590	11/03/2004	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			TRAN. MYLINH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2179	7

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/897,162

Applicant(s)

BLACK ET AL.

Examiner

Mylinh T Tran

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's request for reconsideration filed 08/17/04 has been entered and carefully considered. However, the arguments are not persuasive. Therefore, claims 1-31 are rejected under the same ground of rejection as forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallagher et al. [US. 6,314,449] in view of Grewal et al. [US. 6,691,159].

As to claims 1, 10, 19 and 25-26, Gallagher et al. discloses a context sensitive help at the computer (column 1, lines 53-57 "When the user double-clicks on a message, a new Web browser window is displayed which includes an HTML page with the message text, a detailed explanation of the message"). The user easily doubles-clicks on a message to get help. The computer system provides on-screen help shows the user information without requiring the user to leave the program. Therefore, Gallagher et al. shows the context sensitive help; and Gallagher et al. also shows generating a second web page comprising the context sensitive information (column 1,

lines 53-57 "..., a new Web browser window is displayed which includes an HTML page with the message text, a detailed explanation of the message".

The difference between Gallagher et al. and the claim is a Web-based UI communication between a first computer and a second computer and determining a set of information that corresponds to the first Web page.

Grewal et al. shows the request for help information at the first computer from the second computer (figure 8, (246, 248), column 2, lines 22-37 and column 4, lines 46-65); the request corresponding to a first Web page of a Web-based UI of the first computer (column 4, lines 46-63); responsive to receiving the request (column 4, lines 55, "Once server system receives the request, server system displays the information in response to this request on client system", the first computer determining a set of information that corresponds to the first Web page (column 4, lines 46-63).

The sever computer system has to do the step of determining the set of information in figure 8, 252, retrieving information step. How can the sever system know which the right information to retrieve if it does not determine by itself. Also, Grewal et al. teaches generating the help information and providing the it to the second computer for presentation (figure 8, 254).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Gallagher et al. and Grewal et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify the context sensitive help of the Web page as taught by Gallagher et al. to include a Web-based UI communication

between a first computer and a second computer of Grewal et al., with the motivation being to provide a user with help information without requiring the user to leave the context of the computer program within which the user is working as taught by Grewal et al.

As to claims 2, 9, 11, 18, 24, 30 and 31, Grewal et al. also discloses the first computer being a server appliance (figure 8, 246, column 2, lines 12-37, computer system).

As to claims 3 and 12, Gallagher et al. teaches generating the second Web page in a format that is compatible with a platform of the second computer, the platform comprising a hardware platform, an operating system platform, a Web browser type indication, a software version indication, a preferred language indication, an intended use of the second computer, and/or predetermined preferences of a user (column figure 5, column 2, lines 24-50, the computer system of Gallagher et al. comprising a hardware platform...).

As to claims 4 and 13, while Grewal et al. shows the communication a Web-based UI between a first computer and a second computer, Gallagher et al. shows the Web-based UI comprising a first Web page corresponding to one or more predetermined functions of the first computer (figure 4).

As to claims 5 and 14, Gallagher et al. in view of Grewal et al. provides responsive to determining the context sensitive help information, retrieving

the context sensitive help information from one or more help files (column 3, lines 1-7, the help information should be stored in a storage device, files...).

As to claims 6, 15, 21-23 and 28-29, Gallagher et al. also provides communicating, by the first computer, a Web-based UI to the second computer, the first computer being operatively coupled over a network to the second computer, the Web-based UI comprising a first Web page corresponding to one or more predetermined functions of the first computer, the first Web page comprising a unique ID and a persistent help object that is mapped to a URL of the first computer, the URL comprising the unique ID; and wherein determining the context sensitive help information is based on the unique ID (column 3, lines 1-25, each of message (link) has its own identifying number).

As to claims 7, 16 and 20, Gallagher et al. in view of Grewal et al. demonstrates wherein the URL further comprises a reference to one or more computer programs on the first computer; and wherein the operations of determining the context-sensitive help and retrieving the context sensitive help are performed by the one or more computer programs that use a server-side scripting interface (column 2, lines 22-58).

As to claims 8 and 17, Gallagher et al. in view of Grewal et al. also demonstrates the URL further comprises a reference to one or more computer programs on the first computer; and wherein the operations of determining the context sensitive help and retrieving the context sensitive

help are performed by the one or more computer programs using a server-side scripting interface that generates dynamic content (column 2, line 37 through column 3, line 7, the help information is changed based on what kind of help information user needs).

As to claim 27, Gallagher et al. shows context sensitive help control being a representation of a question mark (figure 4).

Response to Arguments

Regarding claims 1-31, Applicant argues the references do not teach "receiving a request for context sensitive help". However, Gallagher et al. discloses a context sensitive help at the computer (column 1, lines 53-57 "When the user double-clicks on a message, a new Web browser window is displayed which includes an HTML page with the message text, a detailed explanation of the message"). The user easily doubles-clicks on a message to get help. The computer system provides on-screen help shows the user information without requiring the user to leave the program. Therefore, Gallagher et al. shows the context sensitive help. Also, Grewal et al. shows the step of receiving a help request to sever (figure 8, 246). In combination of Gallagher et al. and Grewal et al., they disclose the feature of "receiving a request for context sensitive help".

Applicant also argues the references do not show "generating a second Web page". However, Gallagher et al. also shows generating a second web page comprising the context sensitive information at column 1, lines 53-57.

Applicant's attention is directed to the lines "When the user double-clicks a new Web browser window is displayed which includes an HTML page with the message text, a detailed explanation of the message".

Applicant has argued that Grewal does not teach "providing context sensitive help from a first computer to a second computer for a Web-based user interface (UI) of the first computer". However, Grewal provides help information from a first computer to a second computer for a Web-based user interface of the first computer (figure 8, 246, 248, column 4, 46-63, figure 1, the first computer (client system), second computer (server system)). The teachings of Grewal combine with the feature "context sensitive help" (above) of Gallagher to provide the limitation of "providing context sensitive help from a first computer to a second computer for a Web-based user interface (UI) of the first computer".

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action.
In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4141. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8.00AM to 6.30PM.

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (571) 272-4136.

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2179

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER